



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/982,530

10/18/2001

Ross Faulkner Smith

60001.0097US01/MS172025.1

7764

27488

7590

10/12/2007

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)

P.O. BOX 2903

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/12/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/982,530

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David E. England.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Alton Hornsby III Reg. No. 47299.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 05 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, 8 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Terry (6961765).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Attorney discussed purposed amendments that would aid in furthering prosecution. Examiner agreed that the cancellations of the limitation in claim 8, "before uploading the logging file to the remote analysis server", would overcome the 112 rejection. Furthermore, the addition to claim 11 stating a "computer readable hardware storage medium" seems to overcome the 101 rejection and will consult their QAS for further assurance. Claim 5's amendment puts more emphasis on the job of the hooks and would require further search to determine patentability. Claim 1's amendment adds the use of a registry key, which was not present in the claim previously would require further search to determine patentability. Examiner as pointed out to the Attorney that Terry teaches the use of registry keys. The Attorney would need to respond in their next response, specifically to the registry keys in both the application and the prior art, how they may be different so it is clear on the record in case this limitation is patentable, Examiner awaits Applicant's official response.

DE